

REMARKS

Claims 1, 6-8, 11, 12, 15-17 and 28-32 have been amended and claims 9, 10, 13, 14 and 18-27 are withdrawn. Claims 1-8, 11, 12, 15-17 and 28-37 remain in the application.

The Examiner rejected independent claim 1 under 35USC§102(b) as being anticipated by Carley.

Applicant has amended claim 1 to recite:

- a plurality of light-emitting diodes each having an anode and a cathode and each configured to emit a respective color of light;
- a resistive member carried over at least one of said anode and said cathode of each of said diodes;
- a plurality of conductive contacts spaced over the resistive member of each of said diodes; and
- a conductive wire coupled to at least a selected one of the contacts of each of said diodes to thereby form an interconnected string of diodes regardless of the orientation of each of said diodes.

The amendment is supported by the filed specification and drawings (e.g., see paragraphs that begin at line 17 of page 3, line 25 of page 4, line 32 of page 4, and line 27 of page 5). In Applicant's claim 1 structure, small contacts are spaced over each of a string of diodes so that each diode's light emission is not inhibited.

As taught beginning at line 32 of page 4 of Applicant's specification, a number of diodes can then be quickly inserted into a mounting structure without regard to their orientation. The wire 28 can then be coupled to at least one contact of each diode because at least one contact of each diode will be oriented properly to receive the wire.

In contrast, **Carley** teaches (with reference to his FIG. 3) a light emitting diode C with "the p region being bonded to the upper extremity of the first portion 18 of the first member" and further teaches "a fine resilient wire 26 --- having the upward end thereof bonded to the n region of the diode C by an electrically conducting bead 30" (column 3, lines 8-9 and 12-16).

With this arrangement, Carley has no need for a plurality of contacts because he simply bonds a wire to the n region of a single diode with a bead at the wire's end. Carley is concerned with placing a single diode within an envelope B and the orientation of that diode is not critical because it is simply bonded to the end of his first member with a wire attached with a bead to the other junction of the diode. Carley has no need for structure that facilitates assembly into a string of diodes because he only places a single diode within an envelope B.

Because Carley thus fails to teach the use of a plurality of conductive contacts, he does not anticipate Applicant's claim 1. Because Carley teaches the use of a simple wire bead, he teaches away from Applicant's structures and cannot therefore contribute to a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to this claim. Accordingly, Applicant's claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the cited art. Because claims 2-8, 11, 12, and 15-17 add further limitations to claim 1, they also patentably distinguish over the cited art.

The Examiner rejected independent claim 28 under 35USC§103(a) as being unpatentable over Carley.

Applicant has amended claim 1 to recite:

a plurality of light-emitting diodes each having an anode and a cathode and each configured to emit a respective color of light; and
a plurality of resistive members spaced over at least one of said anode and said cathode of each of said diodes wherein each of said resistive members has a different resistance;
at least one conductive contact carried on each of said resistive members; and
a conductive wire coupled through a contact to a respective one of the resistive members of each of said diodes to thereby form an interconnected string of diodes that will each carry a respective current when a voltage is applied to said wire.

The amendment of independent claim 28 is supported by the filed specification and drawings. With reference to his FIG. 3, Applicant notes that this structure “permits resistive patterns to be printed on a large number of LEDs without concern to the color of the LEDs – for each of these LEDs, the interconnect member would then be coupled to the resistive pattern that corresponded to the radiated color of that LED” (lines 18-21 of page 5 of the filed specification). Similar to the structure in Applicant’s claim 1, the plurality of resistive members facilitates rapid assembly of a string of diodes that will each carry a current suitable for its radiated color.

Carley teaches the use of a single “built-in resistor R” which can be “bonded between portion 18a --- and a region p of the light emitting diode” or bonded to “portion 20 of second member” (column 3, lines 41-45). Carly has no need for a plurality of resistive members because he only places a single diode in an envelope B and is not interested in rapid assembly, for example, of a string of diodes. Therefore, Carley not only fails to teach a plurality of resistive members spaced over at least one of an anode and a diode but also fails to suggest any reason for doing so.

Because he fails to teach the structure of Applicant's claim 28 and fails to suggest any reason for using Applicant's structure, Carley cannot contribute to a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to this claim. Accordingly, Applicant's claim 28 patentably distinguishes over the cited art. Because claims 29-37 add further limitations to claim 28, they also patentably distinguish over the cited art.

Applicants therefore request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections and objections and an early allowance of claims 1-8, 11, 12, 15-17 and 28-37.

Respectfully submitted,
William R. Ratcliffe

By 
Joseph Compton
Registration No. 34,308

KOPPEL, PATRICK, HEYBL & DAWSON
555 St. Charles Drive, Suite 107
Thousand Oaks, CA 91360
(818) 788-6983